

**Remarks:**

This a full and timely response to the outstanding nonfinal Office Action mailed December 29, 2005 . Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims, as amended, are respectfully requested.

**1. Present Status of the Patent Application**

Prior to entry of the present Amendment, claims 1-25 remained pending in the present application. Upon entry of the amendments in this response, claims 1, 3-10, 12-15 and 17, 18, 24 and 25 remain pending in the present application. More specifically, claims 1, 3-9, 12-15, 17, 18, 24 and 25 are directly amended and claims 2, 11, 16, 19-23 are canceled without prejudice, waiver or disclaimer. These amendments are specifically described hereinafter.

It is believed that the foregoing amendments add no new matter to the present application.

**2. Response To Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. Section 102**

Claims 1, 2, 5-8, 11, 13-17, 19 and 20-23 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Wood et al. (US 6, 453, 127), hereinafter Wood.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and request reconsideration based on features in the claims which are neither disclosed nor suggested in the cited reference.

As to a rejection under §102, "[a]nticipation is established only when a single prior art reference discloses expressly or under the principles of inherence, each and every element of the claimed invention." RCA Corp. v. Applied Digital Data

*Response to Office Action*  
*Serial No. 10/081,484*  
*Attorney Docket No. 10007664-1*

Systems, Inc., (1984, CAFC) 221 U.S.P.Q. 385. The standard for lack of novelty, that is for "anticipation," is one of strict identity. To anticipate a claim, a patent or a single prior art reference must contain all of the essential elements of the particular claims. Schroeder v. Owens-Corning Fiberglass Corp., 514 F.2d 901, 185 U.S.P.Q. 723 (9th Cir. 1975); and Cool-Fin Elecs. Corp. v. International Elec. Research Corp., 491 F.2d 660, 180 U.S.P.Q. 481 (9th Cir. 1974). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim. In re Bond, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

102 rejection of Claim 1

Independent 1, as amended, states:

A system, comprising:

(a) a Web client computer coupled to a network and operable by a user having a personal repository for storing job documents, where the Web client includes an API for accessing the user's personal repository ; and

(b) a Web site coupled to the network and operable to cause the client to display a portal Web page that includes a plurality of hyperlinks each pointing to a unique Web resource that is available over the network; and wherein each of the Web resources can make use of the API in order to access the user's personal repository.

It is respectfully asserted that amended Independent claim 1 is clearly not anticipated by Wood for at least the reason that Wood does not disclose the features that are highlighted in claim 1 above.

More specifically, Wood makes no mention of at least the following claim 1 features:

- 1) A user's personal repository for storing documents;
- 2) A Web Client that includes an API for accessing the user's personal repository;
- 3) A Web site that can cause a client to display a portal Web Page;
- 4) A portal Web Page that displays a plurality of hyperlinks each pointing to a unique Web resource that can make use of the API in order to access the user's personal repository.

Accordingly, Wood clearly does not anticipate claim 1, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

102 rejection of claims 5 and 6

Since claims 5 and 6 are dependent claims that incorporate all the features/limitations of claim 1, Applicants respectfully assert that these claims also are not disclosed by Wood.

Additionally, these claims recite other features/limitations that are not disclosed by Wood as described below.

Claim 5, as amended, states:

5. The system of claim 1, wherein the Web page includes at least one advertisement of a Web resource that can make use of the API in order to access the user's personal repository.

*Response to Office Action*  
*Serial No. 10/081,484*  
*Attorney Docket No. 10007664-1*

10

Nowhere does Wood disclose a portal Web page that includes an advertisement of a Web resource that can make use of the API in order to access the user's personal repository.

For this additional reason, Wood clearly does not anticipate claim 5 and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 6, as amended, states:

6. The system of claim 1, wherein the Web site generates the Web page based, at least in part, upon a job document stored in the user's personal repository.

Nowhere does Wood disclose a Web site that generates a Web page that is based upon a job document that is stored in the user's personal repository.

For this additional reason, Wood clearly does not anticipate claim 6 and the rejection should be withdrawn.

102 rejection of claims 7, 8, 13-15 and 17

It is respectfully asserted that Independent claims 7 and 15 and their respective dependent claims 8, 13-15 and 17 are clearly not anticipated by Wood for at least similar reasons described above in connection with claim 1.

102 rejection of claim 2, 11, 19-23

Claims 2, 11, 19-23 are canceled by this response.

*Response to Office Action*  
*Serial No. 10/081,484*  
*Attorney Docket No. 10007664-1*

11

102 rejection of claim 25

Claim 25 stands rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Gopalan.

Independent 25, as amended, states:

25. A method, comprising:

providing a client computer operable by a user having a personal repository for storing job documents and including an API for accessing the user's personal repository;

displaying a portal Web page on the client computer that includes a plurality of hyperlinks, each pointing to a Web resource that is configured to communicate with the API in order to access the user personal repository.

It is respectfully asserted that amended Independent claim 25 is not anticipated by Gopalan for at least the reason that Gopalan does not disclose the features that are highlighted in claim 25 above.

More specifically, Gopalan makes no mention of a portal Web page that includes a plurality of hyperlinks, each pointing to a Web resource that is configured to communicate with the API in order to access the user personal repository.

Accordingly, Gopalan clearly does not anticipate claim 25, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

*Response to Office Action*  
*Serial No. 10/081,484*  
*Attorney Docket No. 10007664-1*

12

### 3. Response To Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. Section 103

#### 103 rejection of Claim 24

Claim 24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103 as purportedly being obvious over Wood in view of Dalal et al (hereinafter Dalal).

It is well established at law that, for a proper rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious based upon a combination of references, the cited combination of references must disclose, teach, or suggest, either implicitly or explicitly, all elements/features/steps of the claim at issue. See, e.g., *In Re Dow Chemical*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1529, 1531 (Fed. Cir. 1988), and *In re Keller*, 208 U.S.P.Q. 871, 881 (C.C.P.A. 1981).

Independent Claim 24, as amended, recites:

24. A method, comprising:

providing a client computer operable by a user having a personal repository for storing job documents, where the client computer includes a Web browser having a Web extension, the Web Extension providing an API for accessing the personal repository; and

displaying a portal Web page on the client computer that includes a plurality of hyperlinks, each pointing to Web content that is configured to communicate with the API in order to access the user's personal repository.

Independent claim 24 is allowable for at least the reason that the combination of Wood in view of Dalal does not disclose, teach, or suggest the features that are highlighted in claim 24 above.

Response to Office Action  
Serial No. 10/081,484  
Attorney Docket No. 10007664-1

13

More specifically, nowhere does Wood or Dalal describe any of the following features of claim 24:

1. A user's personal repository for storing job documents;
2. An API for accessing the user's personal repository;
3. Displaying a portal Web Page that includes a plurality of hyperlinks each pointing to WEB Content that can make use of the API in order to access the user's personal repository.

Consequently, the combination of Wood in view of Dalal does not render claim 24 obvious, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

103 rejection of Claim 3, 4, 9, 10, 12 and 18

Claims 3, 4, 9, 10, 12 and 18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103 as purportedly being obvious over Wood in view of Gopalan et al.

103 rejection of Claim 3

Claim 3, as amended, recites:

3. The system of claim 1, wherein the Web site includes a browsable database of information regarding Web Resources that are available over the network and that can make use of the API in order to access the user's personal repository.

Independent claim 3 is allowable for at least the reason that the combination of Wood in view of Gopalan does not disclose, teach, or suggest the features that are highlighted in claim 3 above.

More specifically, nowhere does Wood or Gopalan describe a browsable database of information regarding WEB resources that can make use of an API in order to access the user's personal repository for storing job documents.

Consequently, the combination of Wood in view of Gopalan does not render claim 3 obvious, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

103 rejection of Claims 4, 9, 10, 12 and 18

Claims 4, 9, 10, 12 and 18 recite similar limitations as claim 3 and consequently, the combination of Wood in view of Gopalan does not render these claims obvious for at least the reasons described above in connection with claim 3.

Conclusion

Applicants believe that this application is now in condition for allowance, in view of the above amendments and remarks. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that the Examiner issue a Notice of Allowability covering the pending claims. If the Examiner has any questions, or if a telephone interview would in any way advance prosecution of the application, please contact the undersigned attorney of record.

Date:

4/27/06

By:

Respectfully submitted,  
Shell S. Simpson et al

Matthew L. Wade  
Matthew L. Wade  
Reg. No. 42,206

*Response to Office Action*  
*Serial No. 10/081,484*  
*Attorney Docket No. 10007664-1*

15